



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/813,483

03/29/2004

Jun Liu

P2026R1

5594

9157 7590 06/04/2008
GENENTECH, INC.
1 DNA WAY
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

EXAMINER

KIM, YUNSOO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1644

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/813,483	Applicant(s) LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner YUNSOO KIM	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,20,22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment filed on 3/5/08 has been entered.
2. Claims 1, 3-8, 20 and 22-25 are pending and under consideration
3. In light of Applicants' amendments to the claims, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), 35 U.S.C. 103(a), 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph (sections 3-6, 11-14 of the office action mailed 9/5/07) have been withdrawn.
4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 3-8, 20 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/26909 (IDS reference, of record), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,994,511 (IDS reference, of record) for the reasons set forth in the office action mailed 9/5/07.

The '909 publication teaches a stable protein formulation comprising 10 mM histidine, 160 mM arginine-HCl at pH. 7, protein concentration of about 160mg/ml and 0.05% of polysorbate (claims 1-49, in particular).

Art Unit: 1644

The '909 publication further teaches that the stable protein formulation adds stability to the protein and enhances therapeutic applicability (p. 5, in particular).

Claims 4-5 are included in this rejection because the concentrations of 180mg/ml or 200 mg/ml are well within the purview of optimization of about 160mg/ml.

In addition, having low turbidity, kinematic viscosity about 50cs and having osmotic pressure from 270-328 mOsm are inherent property of the protein formulation comprising 10 mM histidine, 16 mM arginine-HCl at pH. 7 and 0.05% of polysorbate.

The '909 publication does not teach rhuMabE25 as in claims 16 and 17, article or manufacture with syringe or injection device as in claims 22-25.

However, the '511 patent teaches rhuMabE25 (Table 1, claims 9-10, in particular) composition and an article of manufacture comprising syringes or injection tools (col. 58-59 overlapping paragraph, in particular).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to stabilize rhuMabE25 as taught by the '511 patent with a formulation comprising a buffer comprising histidine, arginine and polysorbate as taught by the '909 publication.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so because the '909 publication teaches that a formulation comprising histidine, arginine and polysorbate adds stability to any antibodies and prevents degradation proteins (p. 5, in particular).

From the teachings of the references, one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of the ordinary in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Applicants' arguments filed on 3/5/08 have been fully considered but they were not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicants traversed the rejection based on that the claimed rhuMabE25 does not behave as other antibodies at the high concentration range and Liu et al reference is provided. Applicants argued that Liu et al. show in Fig. 1 that the concentration of antibody at 120mg/ml to have 47.6 kinematic viscosity and lack of a particular combination of excipients in any antibody formulation would have a viscosity in excess of 50cs.

However, the Liu et al. reference supports that there is change in the viscosity with increase of concentration (Fig. 1, in particular) but the reference is silent about the claimed range is enabled or the referenced more than 100mg/ml is not enabled. Both Fig 1 -3 of Liu et al. show the addition of sucrose and NaCl help reducing the viscosity and the '909 publication discloses addition of sucrose and NaCl as well (claim 3, p. 11 Table 3). Regardless of viscosity being less than 50cs is a specific characteristic of rhuMabE25, the combination of references which teaches the 160mM of arginine, 3-60mM of secondary buffer (e.g. histidine at 10mM in claim 49) at 160mg/ml of protein in the presence of 0.05% of polysorbate results in the claimed invention. Therefore, the referenced invention is expected to have viscosity less than 50cs and the combination of references remains obvious.

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1, 3-8, 20 and 22-25 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 7-13, 22-27, 31-34, 37-42, 48, 51-56, 58 and 59 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,432 B2 in view of US 2004/109243A1.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant's response filed on 3/5/08 has been fully considered but they were not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the amended claim limitation of arginine being minimum of 100mM has not been claimed in the '432 patent.

However, the '432 patent recites acid, base and/or buffer at 150mM-200mM (claims 32-34) which encompasses the arginine concentration of at minimum of 100mM. Therefore, the amendment to the rejection does not obviate this rejection.

8. No claims are allowable.

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YUNSOO KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3176. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen B. O'Hara can be reached on 571-272-0878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

Art Unit: 1644

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yunsoo Kim


Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

May 29, 2008

/ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1644

<div><div>Application Number</div><div></div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/813,483	LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YUNSOO KIM	1644	